Addressed to SCI DBC 7/29/83

(Dolan)
July 20, 1983
10:00 a.m.

DOLAN SPEECH

The American experience with the British aristocracy has been somewhat limited -- at least since the latter part of the 18th century. I think you can understand what it means to an American to be here in this building to address a group of this stature. And this is not even to mention the awe with which many of my countrymen regard all things British, not the least of which is your accent. The publisher of National Review, William Rusher, has over the years brought together a compendium of personal wit and wisdom known amongst his admirers as "Rusher's Laws". One of the laws says if you want an American to believe something get an Englishman to tell him it's so.

But here I am today in, as the social scientists would put it -- albeit badly -- a role reversal. But I take heart. You may remember that when the President addressed the Parliament last June he said he was fearful on just this count; but added that he was encouraged by the tolerance you usually show your younger if somewhat less-tutored cousins. He stressed the "usually" because he recollected Winston Churchill's famous loss of patience with his American counterpart, one of our most distinguished diplomats, John Foster Dulles. At a press conference no less, Churchill said of Dulles, "He is the only case I know of a bull carrying his own china closet with him."

I readily admit we Americans have earned a reputation for a certain roughness around the edges, a kind of distruptive naivete, a certain lack of Old World learning.

The American tourist is held largely responsible. The husband and wife, for example, who got off the tour bus at the art gallery in Florence. As they entered the first room of masterpieces, husband said to wife: "O.K., Rose, you take this side, I'll take that."

And then, of course, there was the American couple gazing on the Mona Lisa in the Louvre. Wife to husband: "Fred wouldn't that look nice next to the picture window in the living room."

My friend, Rev. Bernard Bassett of Oxford, is unrelenting on this subject: He likes to amuse his American retreatants with some of the scandalous things you used to say about our GIs when they were stationed here in World War II.

"What is the difference," one story went, "between an American chewing gum and a cow chewing his cud." British answer: "The look of intelligence on the cow's face."

Shortly before his visit here to you last June the President talked to some of us on these matters. In one conference on his speaking schedule he mentioned that just after the war when he was in England making a wonderful film called the Hasty Heart a British army officer explained to him the essential difference between the English and the Americans with this story.

One day during the war this officer was standing in a pub with another group of British servicemen. A group of American airmen entered nosily, set up a round or two, got a bit rowdy and started making some toasts that were less than complimentary to Great Britain -- and especially to British leadership, as a matter of fact, royal leadership.

To heck (and I'm not quoting their words exactly) " . . . to heck with . . . a prominent member of British royalty," the Yanks shouted.

Properly offended and not to be outdone -- the British officer and his friends responded with a toast of their own:

"(and here the quotation is more exact) . . . to hell with the President of the United States."

Whereupon all the Americans hastily grabbed their glasses, hoisted them high and shouted, "By God, we'll drink to that."

So, I would like to think we Americans take our rough reputation with some good humor and perhaps even with a little pride. A certain rambunctiousness after all, is the privilege of youth -- we have been a Nation for only a little over two centuries, fully on the world stage, for only a generation or two. During Watergate Harold MacMillian was generous enough to note that the British should be understanding towards America's troubles: Your own early history, he pointed out, was more than a little uproarious. My personal favorite is about one of your early kings -- one of the Henrys as I recall -- who demanded angrily of the Duke of Dublin whether it was true he had burned down the local cathedral. Yes, the duke replied, but only because I thought the Archbishop was inside.

Enough of this, because I am here today to talk about the business of speechwriting in the Reagan White House.

First, the process. I am always amazed at the interest in this; the questions never seem to stop. The President gives a fair number of speeches, not to mention the remarks he makes

almost daily at Rose Garden or East Room ceremonies; all of these texts travel the usual White House channels and the whole business seems a matter of very unremarkable routine.

Still, there seems to be an unquenchable thirst for the behind-the-scenes story. So unspectacular though I find it, here it is. A request for a presidential appearance is sent to us by a public group or member of Congress; it goes on to scheduling, the domain of Presidential Assistant, Michael Deaver. There are certain constants in deciding what invitations are accepted: does it fit the schedule, can the occasion be used to emphasize the President's personal concern about a problem or a policy decision that is imminent? All of you are sophisticated about this sort of thing, there is a kind of weird symbiosis that takes over -- time, event, people and policy all curiously intermix, somehow a national event is born as the President makes plans to address the NAACP on social justice or the Catholic educators on tuition tax credits or homebuilders on our tax and spending programs. Obviously the message is to be aimed not just at the immediate audience but to the media, the Congress, to the American public.

After the decision is made to go with an appearance -- a writer and researcher is assigned; we talk to the President, look at what he's said in the past to this group or on that issue and come up with a draft. It will get a circulation among the senior staff and the interested cabinet departments -- it will then go, with suggested changes, to the President. Almost always, this will happen after his normal working day. He will sit there in

his shirtsleeves, as I have seen him do, in his upstairs office in the residence. He will take the draft and, as he likes to say, "go to work."

I think those words are the most important aspect of speechwriting at the Reagan White House. I'm going to do startle you now and become one of the few people you will ever meet from Washington, D.C. who will freely admit the title he holds is entirely fraudulent.

Ronald Reagan is his own chief speechwriter -- always has been, always will be. He is also the best speechwriter. And certainly the most prolific.

The President is one of those people journeymen writers find distressing. It's easy for him, he can write out in long hand on a yellow legal pad in a matter of hours the full text of an address. I think back to one of the broadcasts on budget matters last year -- the Gang of 17 speech it was called after the 17 participants involved in White House-congressional negotiations. The President wasn't comfortable with any of the drafts that had been sent to him so on the day of the speech, he simply sat down (with, by the way, a visit and lunch with the Prime Minister of someplace squeezed in between) and produced the text. And it was much the same with the President's recent Central American address to the Congress. The President knew exactly what he wanted; didn't get it from the resident geniuses, sat down and produced it himself in a matter of hours. I doubt many professional writers are capable of that kind of performance even

in our illustrious press corps. Certainly no one else in the government is.

What is important here is not just Ronald Reagan the speechmaker . . . but Ronald Reagan the speechwriter. He has remarkable analytical and descriptive powers, an instinctive grasp of rhetorical devices (you remember the things schoolmasters used to point out about Cicero's speeches: parallelism, the use of repetition, dramatic build -- look at the Reagan speeches over the last few decades). There is an wonderful cadence to his sentences; and his sense of outline, of structure to a speech -- there is a beginning, middle and an end -- is highly developed.

As I say it comes natural. The other day, in the Oval Office, the President told a story about welcoming home -- as California's Governor -- our P.O.W.s from Vietnam. He related it vividly, in rich detail. It was a remarkable display of spur-of-the-moment eloquence about an event long ago; it was moving and unprepared.

Yet for all of this I would take issue with those who label him simply the great communicator. I say this because a successful political speech is more than mellifluous words, more than just a performance. There are plenty of people who speak words well. Ronald Reagan does that -- his voice and presence are engaging. But there is far more to his rhetorical success than that.

His speeches are imbued with firmly held principles, principles he has spent years thinking about, carfully arguing

and explaining -- and writing about. And writing after all is a syllogistic enterprise. It is precisely that experience which forces people to focus their thoughts, to line up their arguments, to discover what they know, to develop the broad perspective. Over the years Ronald Reagan's speeches have borne a personal stamp of syntax, logic and insight, all brought to bear for a personal political philosophy that has been developed through three decades. Indeed, this is a most unusual point about him, his own years in public life have been dominated not so much by a lust for high office or great power as by a conscious effort to write, to think, to reflect, to gain that broad perspective -- to make if you will public statements that made sense.

And so in an age that puts so much emphasis on style and with a president renown for his speaking style, the Reagan speeches have relied in large part on something else for their success. The great communicator has also been the great "rhetorician," in the classical sense of that word. He knows a good speech must provide information and close argument and the speaker must be willing to let the text do much of the work. That's why the Reagan speeches work, they go somewhere, they say something. I think they are evidence even in modern politics that substance counts; that ideas really do matter.

This is important to the United States and to your understanding of our country; in the past, a lack of coherence in our political leaders has led to failed presidencies and failed administrations. One former Attorney General noted in a recent

book that the administration he was part of lost totally its sense of direction because it was swayed by so many political pressures and cause celebres. For that administration, the lack of a fixed body of thought or a theoretical and rhetorical framework into which policy decisions could be fitted was fatal.

This I think could be traced to the pre-Reagan decline in the value placed on speechwriting in American politics -- the easiest vehicle for conveying the best thinking of an administration. Indeed, to many Washington operatives saying something in public -- the speech -- had become something a candidate or public official also does, a sort of addendum to his real duties. Those real duties were supposed to be something called managing the bureaucracy -- which actually meant getting bogged down in the minutiae of public office, the day to day staff work, the attempt to answer this complaint, to put out that brushfire, pacify this special interest -- ultimately, to be all things to all people.

The irony is, of course, that by not making this sort of concern his first priority, Ronald Reagan has been more successful at running the bureaucracy and mollifying the special interests than his predecessors. Besides setting out the agenda for the Nation and the Congress, the President has used his speeches as a managerial tool. Rather than issuing executive orders itemized to the nth degree in a fruitless attempt to control every last aspect of an impossibly large bureaucracy, the President has chosen the far more effective course of setting directions and parameters for the middle managers in Government

through mood and tone and general guidelines. (A recent bestseller, In Search of Excellence, a study of successful American corporations, finds that shared values and a sense of mission are far more important to successful management than corporate structures or manipulated rewards.)

And by not backing off his principles, by sticking to them and publicly arguing their importance, he has also had considerable success with the special interests. Even members of the electorate who do not agree with his positions, derive a sense of well being from a public leader whose general policy thrust they understand, whose views are manifestly coherent and consistent. (Even if they disagree. It does seem that electorates in modern democracies will tolerate negatives about their leaders but not incomprehensibles.) In any case, it is this sense of well being that stabilizes the vital signs of the body politic and makes surgery on our national problems possible. As the President once put it, consensus flows in public life from coherence and consistency, not vice versa.

It is by bringing about this consensus on issues where consensus was said to be impossible, Ronald Reagan has arguably had the most successful first term since Franklin Roosevelt. Witness the success of the Reagan legislative agenda. In achieving this, I think the President has suggested that the key to successful leadership in a modern democracy lies not nearly so much as we think in looking good or sounding good as in saying something comprehensible, something intelligible.

The President sees his addresses as the vehicle for accomplishing this. For him the speeches are at the core of what a president does, particularly in a system where his national mandate must be frequently replenished, a very different sort of system from your own where a prime minister retains the confidence of a parliamentary majority and retains the option of calling new elections.

And in this way, Ronald Reagan has transformed the modern American presidency, he has used his speeches not as an ex-post-facto description of the policy process, an afterthought, but as the culmination of that process.

I think that is why for the most part the Reagan administration has been intelligible. It has a leader who has a sense of how he wishes to have history view his presidency, he has his eye on his broad agenda.

It is precisely this capacity for the overview that I think says something terribly important about the man, Ronald Reagan -- something I think is especially important for Europeans -- who rarely see him in other than a formal setting -- to know.

He is at ease with himself. One catches glances of this close-up; if there is anything more pleasant in this world than a speech meeting with the current occupant of the White House, I don't know it. Even with the enormous cares on his shoulders, he is prodigiously witty, full of jokes and, if it does not sound disrespectful, plain fun. You may remember it was so even on the day he took a bullet in the chest. (I saw something of this myself shortly after he returned to his routine following his

convalescence. We were in a meeting on a speech he was about to give on federalism -- his program to decentralize government in America by returning more power to the States and local communities. One of the very serious minded young aides kept insisting that he had seen an earlier draft of the federalism speech. The President who remembers what he has seen and hasn't seen, insisted that he had not. "Oh, yes sir, you did," said the young aide, "In fact, you had the text in your papers the day you were shot."

"Oh, now I remember," the President responded, his eyes beginning to twinkle, "that was the night I neglected my homework.")

There is a peace about him. He lacks all the strange inhibitions and drives -- the demons, the wild creatures -- that so frequently take up residence in the personas of public men.

Sanity is something to be valued in public men. I think Ronald Reagan's stems from his origins. Hugh Sidney, who writes a column on the American presidency for Time magazine, once described Ronald Reagan -- in the shrewdest remark ever made about him -- as "a small town romantic". Ronald Reagan is from America's small town culture, once nostalgically described by Ray Bradbury as "the clapboard houses, the boys playing baseball on summer nights, the families sitting on porches." He really believes in the values exemplfied in the homey scenes of Norman Rockwell for the old Saturday Evening Post: the good cheer, the horse sense, the gift for dreaming. (Forgive a personal note here but I spent 6 years as a newspaper reporter in a mid-sized American city and I covered the Middle Americans: their Kiwanis

clubs, their church suppers, their city council meetings, their fights with City Hall. I think I can report that those people out there in the shopping centers and bowling alleys are sound and good; that their America still does exist and that Ronald Reagan embodies their strengths. Indeed, I think it is interesting that at least one of his potential opponents in the next presidential race is now placing talk about "traditional values" at the center of his campaign -- those themes of work, family, neighborhood, country and religion that the President so skillfully emphasized during the 1980 contest.)

I am not here to try and suggest that the story of Ronald Reagan is that of bare-virtue triumphant, a sort of Will Rogers goes to Washington. Obviously, he is a man of ambition and accomplishment. He made it in Hollywood, he was a successful president of an important union, he was the two term governor of a State that were it a country would be the 7th largest nation in the world -- and he now holds the office of the presidency.

I sometimes reach for my shootin iron when I hear people say the President is not that incisive or that attentive to matters of detail. I see the speech drafts he sends back -- the sense of what will work and will not work in a public address, the astonishingly accurate recall of statistics or anecdotes of long ago, the ability to persuade.

His mind is piercing; I would say first rate. "I see Mr. President," I said at the end of that speech conference on the federalism speech, "you want to suggest that federalism promotes creativity . . ."

"No," he responded in a retort that would have pleased Jefferson, "it permits creativity."

Ronald Reagan is unusually brainy. But that is not his most remarkable quality -- his clarity of vision and his virture are. (And a good thing too.) But these are qualities that invite to some rather silly minds, many of them in the media, condescension. They dislike small town America; and their distaste blinds them to the current president's high intelligence.

A note here on the media. They really do perform a daily miracle in transferring so much information so rapidly and with so much accuracy. Yet too often the media forgets that the very vehicle that makes possible this miracle -- their proximity to events -- is the major obstacle to any consistent kind of historical perspective. This is why the press tends to underestimate people like Ronald Reagan who change past patterns on them. (My favorite headline from Civil War journalism is about Stonewall Jackson that brilliant hit and run general of the confederacy, following a thrashing he had given some Union forces. It reads: "He declines to fight and runs away." And this is not even to mention Lincoln's press -- who was so frequently criticized for his anecdotes and folksy stories, so rich with wisdom but so misunderstood by the self important and all too serious people in the Nation's capital. Sound familiar?)

Ronald Reagan's political success is derived precisely from his refreshing conviction that there is room for a clear vision, for straight talk, his belief that the democratic process is

essentially a sound and healthy one. He does not believe that success in politics and in governing derives from a lot of inside moves or Machiavellian maneuvers or crude displays to the electorate of what's in it for them -- (this "pragmatism" is especially characteristic of American politicians as they announce what will turn out to be unsuccessful bids for the presidency or of European diplomats as they are about to blunder into another world war). His faith instead lies with the simple attempt to choose the right course and then go explain yourself -- as often and as clearly as necessary -- to the people.

Now all of this is a prelude to speaking directly to the concerns of those of you here today. You have devoted yourself to the defense of the alliance, to the defense of our freedom, to the defense of the civilized ideas that were nourished here in Great Britain: individual liberty, representative government, the rule of law under God.

And I think that with his gift for simple truths (in the sense that all real insight in art, literature or philosophy relies on simplicity) the President has laid out for us the essentials of a foreign policy. Let me mention a few points quickly.

First, from his very first press conference when he pointed out that Marxist/Leninist ideology justifies any form of deceit or mayhem when utilized to further the revolution, the President has made it plain that he does not accept the Soviet formulation that utterances of truth about its empire are acts of aggression or belligerence. From that press conference -- to his Parliament

speech, to his U.N. speech, to his Orlando speech -- the President has made a point of being frank about the Soviets.

If I may, I would like to offer a few observations, strictly personal, on why I believe this to be a crucial development.

First, in view of the wildly intemperate but official and frequent attacks of the Soviet government on Western statesmen (the President, for example, is "lunatic", responsible for a "cesspool") I think the feeling is growing among Western leaders that they are entitled to an occasional lapse into the truth as a form of response. Second, there is another growing perception: the realization that the most powerful weapon in the Western arsenal quite simply is candor. Few of us in the West have really understood this power -- the Soviets always have. Witness the money they spend on jamming. And I remember Secretary Haig expressing astonishment after his first meeting with one Soviet diplomat who spent most of his time complaining about the President's remarks and speeches. Secretary Haig should have understood the fear totalitarian leaders have of rhetorical candor from their adversaries -- power illegitimately accrued and shared by a tiny oligarchy makes for an enormously fragile (if highly dangerous) regime. No one understands this better than those at the top of this sort of shaky structure. They also know nothing does more to undermine the mythology or their own power than evidence that there are those still brave enough to tend to the seeds of truth.

Indeed, Victor Buckovsky makes just this fascinating point when he explains that the Soviet leaders must always be challenging the West precisely because they must always be sending a message to those they fear most: their own people. The Soviets, Bukovsky says, are riding a tiger, a tiger who can easily go wild. So the message behind their compulsive expansionism is a simple one and directed at their own countrymen: "even the West will not stand up to us, don't you even think about it."

That is why the Soviets fear Ronald Reagan's candor: When the West appears not to be accepting a fate supposedly determined by the scientific laws of history, the reverberations are felt within the empire itself, indeed the whole rationale of the Soviet state is called into question. Hopes of freedom are relit everywhere and internal dissidence is encouraged. The sudden blooming of Solidarity in Poland is the most recent example of how quickly man's aspirations to truth and freedom can get out of control (even in the most repressive of police states) once the truth gets a little growing room. Totalitarian states, like most evil enterprises, are at root fragile and I think the President senses this.

(Forgive one other personal note. In the town I worked in as a reporter, an old political machine has become tied into an organized crime family and word was spread far and wide about their invulnerability and their enormous capacity for crushing those who challenged them. But when a newspaper and a few dedicated citizens spoke out -- and finally when hints of the bad guy's

imminent doom at the the hands of federal investigators were dropped -- the whole multi-million dollar monstrosity collapsed. "Like the Mafia, only worse," former Ambassador Chip Bohlen is reputed to have said about the Soviets. He was talking about their strengths. The weaknesses are also the same.)

There is a third reason why the President's candor is important. We should not forget that the greatest danger of silence about the nature of the Soviets is to ourselves, our own integrity. This is the great moral price we paid during the years of detente. If we do not give voice to our most cherished beliefs, if we do not make -- in public -- the crucial moral distinctions about the world we live in, we lose our grip on those beliefs, on those distinctions. If such values are not nourished through public expression, a kind of moral atrophy sets in and at moments of crisis we find ourselves without the stamina to resist the rhetorical or physical aggressions of our adversaries. Without the exercise of our rhetorical muscles, our moral and intellectual sinews grow lifeless.

Fourth and finally, the President's candor shows us a way out of this dilemma of detente. The problem with the advocates of detente was that they wanted a modus vivideni so badly with the Soviets that they were willing to sacrifice our moral capital (Solzhenitsyn was not welcome at the White House) in order to achieve it. And yet they would then bitterly complain when Congress or the American people did not support their seemingly sudden decisions to reverse course and respond firmly to some inevitable Soviet provocation. The truth is, of course, that in

democracies the electorate will not mount the ramparts or even stand long by their government for the sake of the nuances of some Harvard dean's theory of how to conduct war in Southeast Asia or some professor's theory on the balance of power in the 1970's.' A foreign policy based on the esoteric permutations of a strategic doctrine understood by only a few leaders and diplomats is a foreign policy that doesn't work, at least in a democracy. Our foreign policies must have public support; and so they must be explained. And to the common people they become intelligible -- and this brings us to the sixth point -- only when explained within a framework of right and wrong, in moral terms. This does not mean that on every possible occasion we must vocalize at the top of our lungs about every Soviet transgression but it does mean a long-term commitment to the essential truths about those transgressions. If you will forgive me, too many professional diplomats especially in Europe spend a great deal of energy counseling America to be practical, or machiavellian. They miss the most important point -- that a foreign policy must have a moral center or else it is not a foreign policy at all. That is the point of "public diplomacy."

We need to remind ourselves that the world is not the diplomat's turkey to be carved at will according to the expediencies of the moment. Nor is the struggle now going on in the world a chess game for foreign service types: a few moves, a stalemate, a brandy, handshakes all around and home to bed. All of this is the path to disaster; two world wars in this century should have established that. Always in our memory there

must be the sight of the poor Czechs at the so-called peace conference in Munich trying to discover what the men of affairs had done to seal their fate. Today the freedom of the people of Eastern Europe or the Baltic nations or the republics of the Soviet Union is important. No one has given us the right to be silent on these matters, to barter away their rights.

To our first observation (the President's candor about the Soviet empire) should be added a second: it has generally been skillful candor. In his first press conference, he did not boldy denounce the Soviets as liars and thieves as some have reported, he made the more sophisticated point that their ideology justified such illicit activities and that the West would do well to remember this. Or,a s some of you may remember, in his address to the Parliament, the President took note of a fascinating point made by professor Richard Pipes: that Marx was right; that demands of the economic order are leading to inevitable clashes with the demands of the political order in many modern countries -- except that this is happening not in the capitalistic but in the communist nations. Or look closely at the Orlando speech. The President spoke of America's legacy of evil -- racism, anti-semitism -- and devoted several paragraphs to injunctions against these problems. But he went on to note that the greatest human suffering in this century has been done by those who use the state to totally subserviate the individual -- and that the exponents of this theory make themselves the focus of evil in the modern world as long as they hold to it.

I would argue that in all of these remarks about the Soviets there has been present something more than harsh ananthema or hurled thunderbolt. As Hannah Arendt suggested in a book some years ago on the Eichman trail, evil at its root is banal. Naked denunciations tend only to glamorize it and make it more important than it is. Ronald Reagan, as a matter of instinct, avoids that course; for more than 25 years his reflections on communism have been pointed rather than harsh.

On a third point, and consistent with what has gone before, the President has also suggested that the old policies of containment, detente and brinkmanship are inadequate -- that they are essentially defensive postures. I think the President believes that we in the West for too long have expressed our foreign policy goals in the negative: i.e. resistance to Soviet expansionism. More is needed to rally the world than a negative formulation. This the President has given us. It was his personal decision last year to speak to you about democracy on the march, of a day when all the people of the world will enjoy freedom. Indeed, he has used the term a "forward strategy for freedom" as a goal of the Western democracies. (I was asked in Paris by Andre Fontaine the editor of Le Monde, if this was not more of John Foster Dulles' "rollback" theory. I said no. I said it because, as the President has suggested, the direction of history and the aspirations of mankind are towards democracy, towards a recognition of human rights. So it is the totalitarian states who are the obstructionists; it is they -- not we -- who are for "rollbacks".)

A fourth key element in the President's foreign policy remarks has been an unrelenting concern with the danger of nuclear war and an unswerving commitment to negotiations with the Soviets, especially in the nuclear arms area but also on a broad range of issues. Some may find here -- in view of the President's candor about the Soviet system -- a contradiction. I think not. Those who are candid with themselves about our Soviet adversaries are also the most apt to make progress in negotiations with them. I would remind you an administration that began its foreign policy initiatives with a declaration renouncing "an inordinate fear of communism" and rushed to Moscow with new SALT proposals was the administration that ended with headlines proclaiming the worst state of East/West relations in decades: the years of the Afghanistan invasion, the Olympic boycott, the grain embargo, the actual talk of war before a joint session of Congress by a president deeply concerned about Soviet intrusions in Southwest Asia. It is self-delusion that brings us to the brink, to confrontations, not honesty.

The Soviet regime is totalitarian, and the evil of totalitarianism lies in its irresistible impulse to justify itself at home and abroad by ever increasing attempts to acquire more real estate. Every publicly expressed self-delusion or spontaneously proferred concession by the other side is viewed by them as a weakness to exploited. The Soviets negotiate seriously only when they know their interlocutors are serious people, who know what they are about, who are not afraid to say so and say so publicly and who cannot be intimidated or exploited.

I think the problem lies with those of us in the West who tend to "mirror image" the Soviets -- to think their minds work like our own. We forget or underestimate the burdens carried by those at the top of illegitimate, totalitarian regimes. Such enterprises are by nature expansionist; their rulers -- far from taking offense when confronted -- only become manageable when their designs are understood and exposed -- in full public view. The West has not lacked a foreign policy or a strategic doctrine nearly so much as it has a phenomenology of evil. Much of the Western cognescenti has trouble grasping this. I sometimes think a more careful attention to MacBeth, or a study of the reign of Henry VIII or a rereading of Shirer's history of the Third Reich would do more for Western diplomats or statesmen than all of the technical or scholarly works on the Soviets in Foreign Affairs Magazine. Evil expands unless it is brought to book. The President's candor about the Soviets helps us along the path towards negotiations, it does not obstruct it.

Finally, I think there has been something daring and altogether new in the President's foreign policy pronouncements. He has said we are going to win. He holds that inherent strength of Western values and beliefs in such that they will permit us not to contain: but "to transcend communism"; that communism, like most evil enterprises, is compelled to commit greater and greater outrages until it ultimately self destructs; that communism, therefore, is an episode, a "sad bizarre chapter in human history whose last pages even now are being written." He has even suggested on one occasion to Mrs. Thatcher that perhaps

the time has come for Western leaders to begin planning for the post-Soviet world.

It is a courageous thing -- in a world so legitimately concerned with Soviet power and the danger of nuclear war -- to say such things. Partly, of course, there is the innate optimism of small town America here. And by the way its shrewdness. From the start, the only really attractive thing the Soviets have had going for them, especially with the Third World, is their subtle exploitation of the immensly powerful and perfectly human desire to be on the side of the winners. Strip away the bogus humanitarianism and the general silliness and that is the central appeal of Marxism/Leninism. The President is taking this one great weapon from the Soviets when he claims it is the Western democracies who are in the vanguard of history.)

But this is more than a tactic. The President believes it -- traces of this were emerging in his speeches in the 70's. And if we think him too optimistic, we should recall that his daring point is repeated by some of the most celebrated minds of our century.

"The whole world is drenched with the crude conviction that might accomplishes all, righteousness nothing," Alexander Solzhenitsyn observed in suggesting that truth and virtue have enormous power.

And William Faulkner, a magisterial writer, not exactly pollyanna, predicted when he received the Nobel Prized that man in the face of war and totalitarianism would not merely endure, "he will prevail." He will prevail because he will return to the old verities and truths of the heart."

"He is immortal because the alone among creatures. . . has a soul, a spirit capable of compassion and sacrifice and endurance."

Recently, a cinematic account of this human capacity for compassion and sacrifice and endurance greatly moved Ronald Reagan. Word tends to get around the White House when the President is pleased. Let me tell you about it. We Americans do not much like to lose, particularly at sports, and we are not wild about seeing films commemorating the event. But, I can assure you not just the President but the whole nation was moved by the wonderful story of your two victorious British athletes in the 1920 Olympics. You may remember the story of Harold Abrahms, a young Jew, whose victory -- as his Italian immigrant coach put it -- was a triumph for all those who have escaped oppression and come here to England for refuge and freedom. It was the triumph too of Eric Liddell a young Scot whose own refusal to sacrifice his religious convictions for fame spoke to the great heritage of our civilization.

There is a moving scene when Liddell reads the words of Isiah: that those who wait upon the Lord shall renew their strength, that they shall mount up with wings as eagles, they shall not run and not be weary.

I think this is Ronald Reagan's incredible contribution; he believes in the enormous strength our civilization derives from its commitment to a higher law, a greater destiny. As Jefferson

pointed out, as your own distinguished historians Sir Kenneth Clark and Christopher Dawson have noted -- this spiritual insight is the basis of our civilization, the reason for the flowering of our arts and philosophies, the seedbed for our ideas about the dignity of man and his right to self-government. The President believes that we are up to the struggle ahead and that the spiritual insight of the West can be the source of incalcuable strength, our ultra secret.

So what then? Another spring for Prague, this time one that endures? Solzhenitsyn at the Finland Station? High mass in the Lubyanka?

This is not so outrageous. We have been this way before. You remember more than four decades ago, another American president told his people they faced a rendevous with destiny, a British prime minister asked his own people for their finest hour. To our two peoples, Ronald Reagan has been bold enough to suggest that once again we have such a rendevous, such an hour before us. He believes victory can again be ours -- but that we must go forward boldly and together -- if you will, as on chariots of fire -- to stand for freedom, to speak for humanity, to usher in a new age conjoining all the wonders of modern life with the realization of man's oldest aspirations for peace and freedom.

The words of Tennyson are fitting, are they not? "Come my friends and let us seek a newer world."